## Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

1994

In re Application of )

GTE CALIFORNIA INCORPORATED ) File No. W-P-C-7097

CC Docket No. 94-81

For Section 214 Authority to provide video channel service to an affiliate in Cerritos, California

To: Chief, Common Carrier Bureau

MOTION FOR DEFERRAL OF RULING

APOLLO CABLEVISION, INC.

Edward P. Taptich Anne M. Stamper GARDNER, CARTON & DOUGLAS 1301 K Street, N.W. Suite 900, East Tower Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 408-7100

Its Attorneys

October 11, 1995

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

## Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In re Application of	)	
GTE CALIFORNIA INCORPORATED	) )	File No. W-P-C-7097 CC Docket No. 94-81
For Section 214 Authority to provide video channel service to an affiliate in Cerritos, California	) ) )	
To: Chief, Common Carrier Bureau		POCKET FILE COPY ORIGINA

## MOTION FOR DEFERRAL OF RULING

Apollo CableVision, Inc. ("Apollo"), by its attorneys, hereby requests that any Bureau action on the captioned application be deferred until Commission action on a related Apollo Freedom of Information Act request. In support of this request, the following is submitted:

In a reversal of the usual sequence, the captioned application is intended to provide the underlying authority for tariff proposals now being reviewed by the Common Carrier Bureau in this proceeding GTOC Transmittal Nos. 873, 874 et seq.). The investigation of those tariffs includes a consideration of GTE Telephone's proposed conversion of nonregulated investment into regulated assets — both the propriety of that conversion and its rate and competitive implications. In a "Petition To Deny" filed September 13, 1995. Apollo opposed a grant of the captioned application.

In page 6 of the application, in describing its "accounting safeguards" against the potential anticompetitive conduct which Apollo has detailed elsewhere, GTE Telephone states:

The clear implication, therefore, is that GTE's accounting for Cerritos has already been blessed in some fashion by the Bureau's own personnel.

Apollo learned yesterday that such is not the case.

In light of the application statement, Apollo, on August 10, 1995, filed a FOIA request with the Commission, seeking any documentation concerning an Accounting and Audits Division review of GTE Telephone's Cerritos "accounting systems and records". At a meeting yesterday afternoon among personnel of the Accounting and Audits Division, Apollo counsel and GTE counsel, it was learned that in fact no "review" or "audit" of the carrier's

In response to an earlier MCI challenge to the adequacy of GTE Telephone's nonregulated asset valuation, the carrier similarly stated:

GTECA has filed periodic reports with the Commission and the Commission's staff has conducted audits of GTECA's accounting and financial records.

<sup>&</sup>quot;GTE Rebuttal to Oppositions and Reply Comments," September 30, 1994, p. 5.

Cerritos accounting has occurred since 1988 (prior to the commencement of operations in Cerritos). Moreover, GTE Telephone is objecting to the release of any information concerning either the 1988 audit or a "visit" by unnamed Accounting and Audits Division personnel in December 1993/January 1994 to the Cerritos site.

At this point, Apollo is awaiting the Commission's ruling on Apollo's FOIA request. What is already clear, however, is that in fact there has been no Accounting and Audits Division approval -- and certainly no "review" or "audit", in the ordinary sense of those words -- of GTE Telephone's Cerritos accounting since 1988.

Because Apollo has not been able to obtain information on the matter, however -- a delay occasioned in part by the applicant's procedural conduct -- Apollo is unable to respond to the pleading assertion. Moreover, as a matter of substance, what Commission staff conclusions, if any, may have been reached concerning the adequacy of GTE Telephone's accounting system to support its proposed nonregulatory-to-regulatory conversion of assets, or to protect against the potential anticompetitive effects on Apollo of the carrier/affiliate combination, are matters essential to an informed public interest determination here.

Accordingly, Apollo requests that final action on the captioned application be deferred until the Commission acts on Apollo's FOIA request and, if that ruling is favorable,

until Apollo has an opportunity to comment on the public interest significance of any such information for the application.

Respectfully submitted,

APOLLO CABLEVISION, INC.

By:

Edward P. Taptick

Anne M. Stamper

Gardner, Carton & Douglas

1301 K Street, N.W.

Suite 900-East

Washington, D.C. 20005

October 11, 1995

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mona G. Patterson, a secretary in the law firm of Gardner, Carton & Douglas, certify that I have this 11th day of October, 1995, caused a copy of the foregoing MOTION FOR DEFERRAL OF RULING to be served on the following by first-class mail, postage prepaid:

Kathleen M.H. Wallman\*
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

Geraldine Matise\*
Acting Chief, Tariff Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518
Washington, D.C. 20554

David Nall\*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gail L. Polivy, Esq. GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036 John B. Richards, Esq. Keller & Heckman 1001 G Street, N.W. Suite 500-W Washington, D.C. 20001

Daniel L. Brenner, Esq. David L. Nicoll, Esq. NCTA 1724 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Alan Gardner, Esq. Jeffrey Sinsheimer, Esq. California Cable Television Association 4341 Piedmont Avenue Oakland, CA 94611

Randy R. Klaus Senior Staff Member MCI Telecommunications Corp. 1801 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Mona Patterson

<sup>\*</sup> Hand delivery.